

E. Marban
U.S.S.N. 09/187,669
Page 7

REMARKS

Claims 32-36 and 38-64 are presently pending in the application. Claim 32 was amended. Support for the amendment of claim 32 appears, for example, in the specification and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Claims 32-36 and 38-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action also asserts that support for the previous amendment to claim 46 is not found in the specification and claims as originally filed. Support for the amendment can be found at least at page 2, lines 1, 3, 9, 10; page 3, lines 13, and 20-23; and page 4, lines 14-17.

Claim 32 has been amended for clarification, e.g., the term "modified" in step (c) has been deleted. The preamble of claim 32 has been amended merely to expedite prosecution. However, Applicant respectfully points out that it is common for related methods to have common method steps. The rejection to step (c) was addressed above by the deletion of the word "modified" from step (c). The phrase "wherein the result of expression mimics one or more of the effects of the drug candidate compound" was amended to read "wherein the a result of expression of the protein whose expression modulated in step (a) may mimics one or more of the effects of the drug candidate compound," for clarification. In regard to "corresponding native protein," one of skill in the art, having the benefit of the disclosure, would understand this term, especially in light of the amendment to claim 32.

The Office Action further asserts that claim 46 is vague. Applicant asserts that the methods of "targeted diversity," "rational drug design," and "selective gene suppression techniques," are all well know to those of skill in the art and are thus not indefinite. In fact,

E. Marban
U.S.S.N. 09/187,669
Page 8

Applicant provides many references to literature for these and other techniques in the specification, for example, see pages 2-4 of the specification.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephana E. Patton (Reg. No. 50,373)
Peter F. Corless (Reg. No. 33,860)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
Telephone: 617-439-4444
Facsimile: 617-439-4170

Date: August 8, 2005

Customer No.: 21874